

REMARKS

The above supplemental amendment reflects an agreement reached between the Examiner and Applicants during a personal interview held on September 8, 2010, as summarized below. In this supplemental amendment, claims 2, 15, 28, 30 and 38 are amended. Claims 2, 15, 28, 30, 38 and 40-42 remain pending.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-4494, and please credit any excess fees to the same deposit account.

Summary of Interviews

MAY 4, 2009

The prosecution of this application, along with all but two of Applicants' copending application, was suspended for several years pending the outcome of the appeal of Application Serial Nos. 08/470,571 and 08/487,526 and the reexamination proceedings of seven related patents. Applicants inquired into the status of these applications in January, 2009, as the current six-month suspension period expired. Applicants requested that the suspension of these applications not be renewed. The Office, through Supervisory Examiner David L. Ometz indicated that the suspensions would not be renewed and that prosecution would recommence. Applicants wish to thank Examiner David L. Ometz for the courtesy of the interview held on May 4, 2009 in which Applicants' representatives and the Examiners discussed an overall plan for examination of the remaining 110 applications which relate to this application and have a common chain of priority. Applicants were informed that the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) was developing a plan to resume examination and that Applicants would be informed when the plan was in place.

JULY 22, 2009

Applicants were informed in July, 2009, that a team of examiners had been assembled to examine Applicants' copending applications. Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' Representatives in a meeting held July 22, 2009, with the examination team. In attendance at the meeting were Thomas J. Scott, Jr. and Carl L. Benson, of Goodwin Procter and the PTO personnel identified on the attached list. Applicants' representatives made a presentation to the Examiners in attendance in accordance with the attached agenda and provided the materials attached hereto to the Examiners for their consideration and use in the further examination of this application and the other application related to this application as identified in Tab 2 of the materials provided to the Examiners in the meeting. Applicants' representatives agreed to respond to any telephone inquiries or to be present for personal interview at the PTO in any circumstance where the Examiner believed such an interview would advance the prosecution of this application.

SEPTEMBER 8, 2010

During a personal interview held September 8, 2010, with Examiner Rao and applicants' representatives, the Examiner indicated that claims 29 and 39-42 are considered to be allowable. Applicants provided the Examiner an informal amendment in which several independent claims were amendment to include subject matter indicated to be allowable. The Examiner agreed that the informal amendment would place the application in condition for allowance. The instant amendment to the claims reflects the agreement reached with the Examiner.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, each of the claims in this application is patentable in light of the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue an allowance of this application.

Dated: September 17, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Thomas J. Scott, Jr/

Thomas J. Scott, Jr.

Registration No.: 27,836

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

901 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 346-4000

Attorney for Applicants